

**REMARKS**

The present application includes claims 17-39, 44, 46, and 47. Claims 17-39, 44, 46, and 47 were rejected. By this Amendment, claims 17 and 44 have been amended.

Claims 17, 23-29, 31, 33-36 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,086,415) in view of Gutierrez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,585,540).

Claims 17-20, 22-37, 39, 44, 46, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,053,764) in view of Arnett (U.S. Patent No. 5,238,426) and Gutierrez.

Claims 21 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry in view of Arnett and Gutierrez, and further in view of Rutkowski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,639,261).

The Applicants now turn to the rejection of claims 17, 23-29, 31, 33-36 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez in view of Gutierrez.

Claims 17 and 44 have been amended to recite “wherein the at least one modular jack retention latch directly and releasably engages the at least one modular jack.” During a telephone interview on February 5, 2008, the Examiner indicated that Sanchez does not teach or suggest “wherein the at least one modular jack retention latch directly and releasably engages the at least one modular jack,” as recited in claims 17 and 44. Moreover, the Applicants believe that none of the prior art of record, including Sanchez and Gutierrez, teach or suggest “wherein the at least one modular jack retention latch directly and releasably engages the at least one modular jack,” as recited in claims 17 and 44. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of

claims 17 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez in view of Gutierrez has been overcome, and that claims 17 and 44 are in condition for allowance.

Additionally, claims 23-29, 31, and 33-36 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 17. As described above, claim 17 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 23-29, 31, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez in view of Gutierrez has been overcome, and that claims 23-29, 31, and 33-36 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants now turn to the rejection of claims 17-20, 22-37, 39, 44, 46, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry in view of Arnett and Gutierrez.

Claims 17 and 44 have been amended to recite “wherein the at least one modular jack retention latch directly and releasably engages the at least one modular jack.” During a telephone interview on February 5, 2008, the Examiner indicated that Curry does not teach or suggest “wherein the at least one modular jack retention latch directly and releasably engages the at least one modular jack,” as recited in claims 17 and 44. Moreover, the Applicants believe that none of the prior art of record, including Curry, Arnett, and Gutierrez, teach or suggest “wherein the at least one modular jack retention latch directly and releasably engages the at least one modular jack,” as recited in claims 17 and 44. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 17 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry in view of Arnett and Gutierrez has been overcome, and that claims 17 and 44 are in condition for allowance.

Additionally, claims 18-20, 22-37, 39, 46, and 47 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 17 and 44. As described above, claims 17 and 44 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 18-20, 22-37, 39, 46, and

47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry in view of Arnett and Gutierrez has been overcome, and that claims 18-20, 22-37, 39, 46, and 47 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants now turn to the rejection of claims 21 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry in view of Arnett and Gutierrez, and further in view of Rutkowski.

Claims 21 and 38 depend from independent claim 17. As described above, claim 17 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 21 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curry in view of Arnett and Gutierrez, and further in view of Rutkowski has been overcome, and that claims 21 and 38 are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17-39, 44, 46, and 47 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his time and effort, as well as his assistance with regard to the claims.

CONCLUSION


The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicants may be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Attorney for Applicants at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 16-0228.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 20, 2008

  
James H. Williams  
Reg. No. 56,883  
Attorney for Applicants

Panduit Corp.  
Legal Department -- TP12  
17301 S. Ridgeland Avenue  
Tinley Park, Illinois 60477-3091  
(708) 532-1800, Ext. 1302